

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed March 1, 2006.

By this Amendment, claims 1-4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to their underlying subject matter and rewritten as new claims 5-8. The new claims have been presented to put the claims in better form under U.S. practice and to more particularly define the present invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the original claims, see, for example, page 26, of the specification. Thus, claims 5-8 are currently pending for the Examiner's consideration.

In view of this amendment, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification (via a substitute specification) has been amended to address of the informalities noted by the Examiner. Specifically, the specification has been amended to remove the "*claims by numbers*" references and to incorporate into the disclosure the subject matter of these claims that is necessary to the understanding of the invention. Thus, in light of the changes to the specification, withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has rewritten claims 1 and 2 as new claims 5 and 6 to address the Examiner's concerns. In particular, claims 1 and 2 have been rewritten to (1) make consistent the terminology used in the claims, (2) delete the term "*type*", and (3) provide antecedent basis for all the elements presented in the claims.

Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 61-238640. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention, a single prior art reference must teach each and every limitation of the claims. Here, in this case, JP 61-238640 fails to teach the claimed invention of:

*"A roll stock apparatus comprising:
a turn-table,
a plurality of process rolls standing obliquely in a circumferential
arrangement in one stage or two stages at a roll pallet, said roll pallet being located
on the turn-table,
wherein a longitudinal direction of the process rolls coincides with a
generatrix at a conical surface, and
wherein said roll pallet can be stopped at a predetermined position to
store or take out the process rolls against the roll pallet."*

In reviewing the teachings of JP 61-238640 and in particular, Figure 1, it is clear that the reference fails to teach "*a plurality of process rolls standing obliquely in a circumferential arrangement in one stage or two stages at a roll pallet, said roll pallet being located on the turn-table, wherein a longitudinal direction of the process rolls coincides with a generatrix at a conical surface*". In JP 61-238640, the process rolls are lying on their side and are not *standing obliquely in a circumferential arrangement . . . at a roll pallet*". Further, the process rolls are positioned one on top of each other such that the longitudinal direction of the process rolls clearly cannot coincide with "*a generatrix at a conical surface*". Applicant requests that the Examiner reviews, for comparison, Figures 7 and 8 of the present application in view of the claim language noted above. Applicant believes that Figures 7 and 8 show good examples of the structural orientation of the process rolls of the present invention and how such orientation differs from the process rolls of JP 61-238640.

Thus, since JP 61-238640 clearly fails to teach each and every limitation of the claims, this rejection cannot be sustained and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: May 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
David T. Nikaido

Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng
Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501 Washington,
DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.